

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

Volume II, No. 3

March 9, 1942

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

Amidst Encircling Gloom

THE fall of Singapore has brought the seriousness of the war situation home to all our citizens. We now understand what one of the high officials of the OPM meant recently when he declared: "We have never lost a war; but this is a war which we can lose." It has been difficult for our nation to realize the gravity of our position. Our continental security keeps the physical details of war so far from our shores that imagination finds difficulty in comprehending its realities and urgencies. Furthermore our consciousness of power, our confidence in the unrivalled productive resources of our industries, give us such a strong sense of ultimate superiority over our enemies, that we have regarded immediate perils with something less than the fear which prompts rigorous action.

So it seemed at least until Singapore fell. But the ominous realities are now so plain that even the most heedless must give heed. The fact is that the democratic world is confronted with many months of gravest peril. The Japanese have taken the bastion which represented the keystone of the arch of Pacific security. Despite the heroic defense of the Philippines we cannot be at all sure that MacArthur will be able to hold out. The resources of the Dutch empire may fall to Japan and give her the oil without which no military machine can function. The Indian Ocean is open to her and both Burma and India are now exposed to her attack. Whether she attacks Australia and New Zealand or passes them by for strategic reasons is of small moment. She has in any event all the strategic advantages; and years will be required to recoup the losses suffered.

To add to the darkness of the situation the escape of the German ships from Brest has fostered insecurity regarding the protection of Atlantic lanes. And the failure to defeat General Rommel's army in Africa makes a Mediterranean-African thrust within the next months a virtual certainty. It is no exaggeration to say that the hour is blacker than the months after Dunkirk.

In this situation it is necessary to submit our previous attitude toward the world catastrophe to the most careful scrutiny. Just as our unfavorable strategic position is but the consequence of the false sense of security in which the whole democratic world indulged for the past decades, so our present perils may bring us to disaster if we fail to understand just where we are and what we are doing.

First of all, we must resist the temptation to recrimination between allies, which always arises in moments of adversity. Mistakes have been made upon all sides. There is no gain in measuring the mistakes at Singapore against the mistakes at Pearl Harbor. Already the isolationists of yesterday are using the opportunity to cast aspersions upon the British war effort. This comes with poor grace from a Johnny-come-lately.

Secondly, we must face the prospect of a much longer war than even the most pessimistic had anticipated. In measuring the sacrifices which such a war demands, it is well to remember that now, as at the beginning, their justification is possible only in terms of the alternative which we would have faced had no one resisted tyranny or persisted in that resistance. It is still as true as it was two years ago, that failure to resist to the uttermost will mean the enslavement of the world. What stubborn and unyielding resistance may mean, we cannot tell. We know the consequences of defeat; and that will have to suffice, even though it is not possible to estimate the consequences of victory.

While it is important, particularly for the Church, to lay the moral foundations for a just and lasting peace without which the sacrifices of this war can find no lasting justification, the seriousness of the situation may well dissuade us from the rather blithe efforts at world-reconstruction in which many have been indulging.

Common honesty demands that those who are laying plans for world-reconstruction so assiduously answer this simple question before their own con-

science: Do the plans which they are making presuppose a victory over Fascism or do they not? If they do presuppose such a victory will they kindly draw the proper conclusions? If not we shall be constantly confronted with Pharisaic divisions of labor. The "good" people will presume to have the right, the duty and the virtue to make the peace; while the "bad" people fight the war to the kind of conclusion without which these peace plans are vanity.

In this connection it is necessary to refute the new line of apology of the semi-pacifism which has confused the Christian Church in America so long. The new apology is that the real Christians accept the war as a tragic necessity. They neither abstain from fighting, nor yet fight. Those who actually contend against the foe are debased into the position of sec-

ond-rate Christians. They are accused of self-righteousness, no matter how humbly they acknowledge the mutual guilt of all the nations which has brought about this war. So long as they make distinctions between good and evil in history, and contend against evils more extravagant than their own, they are excluded from the fellowship of real Christians. This kind of spiritual and moral confusion may well contribute to our present weakness, even as it did contribute to past errors.

We face a crisis of unparalleled proportions in world history. If we do not preserve in battle the profoundest resources of the Christian faith, we might well create a situation in which no real reconstruction is possible. But if we do not persevere in battle, the demons of tyranny will triumph over us.

The Christian's Duty in a World at War

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN

CHRISTIANS have many duties in time of war. They have duties as citizens to support their Government, and to maintain democratic institutions unimpaired. They have duties as Churchmen: to maintain their local Churches and to furnish a spiritual ministry for the men in the armed services. But they have one supreme duty which outweighs all the others. It is to supply what the world needs more than anything else—in peace as in war—a simple and compelling Gospel, preached by men who believe it with all their minds, feel it with all their hearts, and prove the sincerity of their faith by their conduct.

Is there anyone of us who will maintain that we are meeting this need as it ought to be met? If so, all that can be said is that those for whom the service is meant have not yet found it out.

For evidence I need only refer to the widely read editorial in *Fortune*, in which the Editor voiced the dismay of his readers at the failure of the ministers to meet the supreme need of the world today. That need, he insisted, was spiritual leadership—some clear and compelling voice, telling men what they must do to be saved. They are not hearing that voice today. Where they look for simplicity, they find confusion. Where they have a right to expect unity, they find division.

We know very well how this situation has come about. It is not because the Church lacks a simple and compelling Gospel. That Gospel is written in the New Testament (which all Christians accept) for all men to read—the Gospel of the righteous and loving God, of man his Son, created free and respon-

sible and called to Brotherhood, of the living Christ, incarnate for man's salvation, of the Church which is His body appointed to be His agent for the establishment of His Kingdom in the world—of the means of grace; of the transformed and transforming life, of the deathless hope. This is our common Gospel which has been confirmed by the experience of all the centuries.

Nor is it because that Gospel is not being preached today. It is being preached Sunday by Sunday from countless pulpits.

Reason for Confusion

Why then this sense of confusion and uncertainty? Because we are preaching so much else. Some of us are preaching our own understanding of that Gospel, in its bearing on the difficult intellectual problems which have been raised by modern science. Others of us are preaching our own interpretation of the consequences of that Gospel in its bearing upon the complicated practical questions of daily life.

These are matters on which, as Christians, we honestly differ, and as finite and sinful men must necessarily differ. It is not wrong that we should differ, or that we should frankly confess our differences. What is wrong is that we should emphasize the things in which we differ above the things in which we agree and that we should make these honest differences an excuse for failing to act together in the things in which we are actually agreed.

When the world was still at peace, it was easy to overlook the danger of this procedure. It was the

natural—one might almost say, the inevitable—result of the rapid increase of our knowledge, and of the variety of new subjects which were making their demand upon time and brain. In our quest of the many things that seemed important, we found it easy, for the moment, to push into the background the few central things that are all important. And the layman looking for leadership from the Church, heard many voices, but no one clear and commanding voice.

And now the war has come, and revealed to us in all its reach and sweep, the appalling consequences of our mistake. At the very time when we have the message the world most needs we see men turning to others for the leadership they have a right to expect from the Church. Whatever else one may think of Hitler and Stalin at least they have something definite to say.

How to Amend Failure

What can we do to make amends for our failure, and to rise to our high calling as witness to the eternal Gospel in a world at war?

The answer can be put in a sentence.—We must recover our sense of proportion. We must put first things first.

This does not mean that we must compromise with our conscience. Far from it. Those who have been pacifists will be pacifists still, and will openly declare their conviction, and the Church will support them in doing so. Those who feel it their Christian duty to serve their country in Army, Navy or Air force will be ready to give their reason for acting as they do and can claim the sanction of the Church in so doing. But whatever their differences from one another, they will maintain their fellowship and unite in witnessing to those central and basic Christian truths in which they are at one. Truths such as these:

That in spite of all the confusion and agony of our time, we are living in a meaningful world. God is in control and He is teaching us by the tragedy of our time lessons which it is essential that we should learn.

That what has come upon us has not happened arbitrarily or wantonly, but because, as individuals and as nations, we have violated Christ's law of love. In this we have all alike been guilty and only as we repent and change our ways can we hope for salvation.

That God's plan for His world and the test by which all progress must finally be judged is the Kingdom of God, the society in which men live together as Brothers, the strong bearing the infirmities of the weak, in honor preferring one another. By this test all plans for the future, political, economic and social, must finally be judged.

That the agent God has chosen for the accomplishment of this purpose is His Church, not the imperfect expression of that Church in the existing

denominations, important, even indispensable, though these may be, but the company of free men and women in every country and in every age who have been living the life of faith in the spirit of love.

That the leader God has given us in this struggle and the pledge of our final success, is the Lord Jesus Christ, man as we are man, bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh, yet God incarnate for our salvation.

This is the witness which is common to us all. This is the faith which can bring order into the chaos of our life. This is the message an agonizing world desperately needs. This is the Gospel of which God has made us ministers of reconciliation.

Intellectual Acceptance Not Enough

But it is not enough to believe this with all our minds. We must feel it with all our hearts and this lays upon us an added and an even more difficult task. For feeling commands the citadel of the will. But feeling is elusive. It does its work below the surface of consciousness and before we know it, may sweep us along a course that we are powerless to stem.

Our task in this war is to *feel* as Christians. First toward our fellow Christians from whom we differ. We must respect them in their honest convictions. We must realize our fellowship with them in spite of difference. And we must find ways in which this consciousness of fellowship can find expression in common action.

Here the Ecumenical Movement has brought us needed reinforcement. The basic principle of that Movement is respect for honest difference. The Ecumenical Movement asks no compromise of conviction. It believes that beneath all differences there are positive affirmations in which Christians can honestly unite.

That belief has been justified by experience. The more frank we have been in our witness to that which seemed to us distinctive, the more vividly we have become aware of that great fund of conviction which is the common heritage of all Christians. So we have entered into a deeper understanding of the word Catholic.

We must carry this process further. We must extend it to our fellow Christians of enemy countries. We must resist every temptation to feel toward them as enemies. We must remember that they too are members of that body for which Christ died and in which He still lives.

It is easier to do this today than it was in the last war. Ties have been formed in our Ecumenical experience that all the strain of the war has not been able to part. Here—for reasons that will be readily understood, it is not possible to tell the whole story. Suffice it to say that in our consciousness of the Ecu-

menical Church we must never forget our German and Japanese fellow Christians.

But we must go further still. There is that great company of persons outside of all touch with organized Christianity—narrow people, as they often seem to us, selfish, prejudiced—blind to the great issues that stare us in the face,—Americans for America only—persistent advocates of the status quo.

It is easy to dismiss this whole group as negligible or to feel toward it as hopeless. But this is just what we must not do. They too are to be future citizens of the new order that is to be—either of the kind for which we are working and praying, or of another,—and if we are to win them to our cause, we must begin to feel toward them as possible future citizens and let them know that we feel in this way. Who knows how far our own narrowness and prejudice have helped to make them what they are? Who knows but a different attitude on our part may uncover points of contact and sympathy to which hitherto we have been blind?

Test of Christianity

And as we feel we must act. Here we reach the acid test of our Christianity,—the standard by which all that we say must finally be judged. And here one can speak briefly, not because what is to be said is unimportant, but because it is so familiar.

We know only too well what we ought to do. There is the ministry to our armed forces in Army, Navy and in the Air. They need Chaplains who know what the Gospel means and feel toward the men against whom they must fight as Christians should feel. We must supply this ministry.

There is the service in Camp communities. Here a sudden strain is being put upon many weak Churches which they are unable to meet alone. We of the stronger Churches must help them to meet it.

There is the maintenance of the institutions of religion and of philanthropy under the added strain which high taxation and depleted personnel will make upon our resources. We who remain must step into the breach and do the work of these who have been drafted to active service.

There is the work for refugees in our own country and across the Seas—a work whose magnitude we have not adequately begun to appreciate, and at which we have made only a beginning. We must take this responsibility seriously and make these desolate and lonely war victims feel that in the Church of Christ they have a friend.

There is finally the Ecumenical Movement in its widest sense as represented by the Foreign Missionary enterprise and the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches. Here is one of the brightest spots in what would otherwise be a dark picture. Here the reality of our Christian fellowship

appears so clearly that everyone can read it. But the strain is great—greater every day, and our resources are being drained. We who remain must supply the lack.

Responsibility of Churches

We pass here from our private responsibility as individuals to our corporate responsibility as Churches. The task is too great to be performed by a dozen independent and separate agencies. It requires a united approach and plans are already being made for such an approach. But to be effective this will require a change of attitude on the part of the leaders of the denominations, far more radical than has yet occurred. We must pool our resources of personnel, of finance, of physical plant. Only so shall we be able to meet, even in smallest degree—the demands that will be made upon us.

In doing this we shall be making the most effective contribution to the peace which is to follow the war. In every country, the thoughts of the Churches are turning to this peace and committees are at work in studying its necessary conditions. This is all to the good. But what shall it profit the Churches to tell statesmen and economists what they ought to do if their own conduct gives their profession the lie.

There are two points on which there is general agreement among Christians, as to the conditions of a just and durable peace. One is that there must be some limitation of political sovereignty. The other is that there must be some pooling of economic resources.

But in the ecclesiastical sphere where the Churches have the power to act, scarcely a beginning has been made in either of these directions. Still each denomination guards its ecclesiastical sovereignty and resents any suggestion of its limitation. Still each denomination—more than this—each local Church regards its economic resources as its own and looks upon all that it does for others as charity. What a mockery of the high words we speak is here. What can we do that will more effectively prepare the way for a just and durable peace than to show that under the strain of war need and war opportunity, the leaders of the Churches can transcend this double limitation and plan and act as one.

Authors in This Issue

Dr. William Adams Brown is Chairman of the Joint Executive Committee representing the World Council of Churches and Emeritus Professor of Systematic Theology at Union Theological Seminary in New York City.

Mr. Denzil G. M. Patrick is Editorial Secretary of the World's Alliance of Y.M.C.A.'s and is at present acting pastor of the American Church in Geneva, Switzerland.

What of Tomorrow?

DENZIL G. M. PATRICK

THE Scriptural injunction, "Take no thought for the morrow," taken in a pseudo-literal way, well represents the attitude of mind of some people in the Anglo-Saxon countries, who say that we should concentrate on getting rid of Hitler, and leave the problems of reconstruction until they are at our door. Fortunately, however, this attitude is much less typical than it was during the last war; and large bodies of responsible Christian people are aware that, while it would be wrong to *worry* about tomorrow, it is our clear responsibility to *plan* for tomorrow according to the best light we have, always ready to modify our plans as new light is given us by God.

While many are therefore giving careful thought to the problems of post-war reconstruction, there is one great barrier which makes it hard for such plans to be truly realistic. This is of course the barrier between the countries which are either directly at war with one another or are cut off from regular intercourse by the exigencies of warfare. This lays a special obligation on those who still have opportunities for contacts across those dividing lines to attempt the task of mutual interpretation and cross-fertilization. This task has always been difficult, but it has become even more so now, in view of the slowness of communications and the rapidity with which events succeed one another. Comments on the state of mind in Europe at the present moment may be already somewhat out of date by the time they have reached the other side of the Atlantic. It is however possible to state certain major trends which require to be kept in mind by those on the other side of the Atlantic who are seeking to prepare to meet post-war problems rapidly and effectively.

No generalization can be made about the mind of European Christians which would be universally true; if one remembers that there are convinced Christians in Hungary and Finland as well as in Yugoslavia and Greece, for example, one sees that individual interpretations would be necessary to do justice to the complexity of the real situation. It is also true that anti-Anglo-Saxon propaganda and complete isolation have not completely failed to produce mistrust and misunderstanding.

On the other hand, the strongest spiritual leadership in Europe today is united in its detestation and condemnation of the overweening claims of National Socialism, and in its sense that that system must be overthrown before any tolerable new order can be built up.

While this spiritual leadership is also united in the conviction that after the overthrow of tyranny and

slavery, it will be necessary to seek to build up a really new order, it has not been able to go so far in its planning as many groups in the Anglo-Saxon countries. The European situation makes it seem somewhat unrealistic to draw up blueprints of a real new order just at the present time. Such thinking as has taken place has been partly stimulated by the excellent studies which have already been done in the Anglo-Saxon countries; and there is real appreciation of these efforts and gratitude for them wherever they are known. On the other hand, European Christian leaders feel that there are certain features in the situation which it is difficult for those outside to understand, but which must be taken into account if the planning for the post-war period is to be truly effective. This article is an attempt to express one or two of them.

European Attitude Toward Reconstruction

There are considerable differences between the European and the Anglo-Saxon approaches to the problems of reconstruction. This is not only because Europeans have already been obliged to learn many things through suffering, but also because they have had to take the challenge of totalitarianism seriously in its positive and not simply in its negative meaning. Most of them agree that there were many unsound things in the old order, which required to be challenged, and which the totalitarian orders have shown up and swept away. In any case, those who have had to live under a totalitarian rule for some considerable time have had their outlook profoundly changed. This is true, not only of those who have fallen victims to the totalitarian ideologies, not only of those who have fallen victims to the spirit of unreasoning hatred of everything connected with these orders, but also of those who have sought to understand the reasons for the success of these orders while at the same time rejecting their demonic claims for absolute control of the whole life of man, and who therefore cannot be satisfied with any new order which is simply a reaction against the totalitarian orders in the direction of the pre-war democratic system.

It is very hard to express the point of view of such people in such a way as to avoid misunderstanding. There are, however, certain definite points on which general agreement may be said to have been reached.

(1) It is quite insufficient to speak of *freedom* by itself as a basis or programme for the new order. Everybody agrees that tyranny and slavery must be

wiped out. But mere liberation from these evils does not touch the root of the problem. After a period of enslavement and suppression, there will necessarily be a period of utter anarchy or authoritarianism. To grant unrestricted freedom to the peoples of Europe immediately on the close of the war would certainly lead to anarchy. There is definite need for some kind of firm central control and guidance, with an adequate backing of force, to ensure tranquillity to the Continent for a long period, so that the conditions for a fruitful exercise of personal liberties may be recovered. In any case, the conception of freedom which would be accepted as valid here is one which is not simply proclaimed as an absolute good in itself, but is counterbalanced by authority, responsibility, and conviction.

Necessity of Authority

(2) Freedom must be counterbalanced by *authority* in order to escape licence. As I have already said, government in Europe in the post-war period will require to be strong and authoritarian. This is not at all the same thing as totalitarian; and it is of the utmost importance that those in the democratic countries should make this distinction very clear in their minds. A totalitarian government is one which claims for its own ends the whole being of man; but an authoritarian government is one which, while it directs the affairs of State with authority and sees that its orders are carried out, yet itself acknowledges the supremacy of law and considers itself unconditionally bound by the engagements it has entered into, both in relation to its subjects and in relation to other governments. A *responsible government* of this second kind may be a thoroughly wholesome one, entirely compatible with the Christian understanding of man, while the former type of government is of course quite incompatible with Christianity.

(3) The most important reason why an authoritarian government will be necessary in Europe during the post-war period is the existence of the *mass-problem*. Totalitarianism succeeded in developing more quickly than any other European regime an effective technique for moving the depersonalized masses of our industrial civilization. But even apart from the demonic character of its technique, it created a graver problem by breaking up many more or less integrated communities which still existed, and developing the mass-mind there also. For this reason it is now generally recognized by responsible leaders that the post-war Europe will have to be socialistic in one form or another. Re-education for the responsible use of individual liberties will be a long process and will require techniques adapted to the changed conditions which have hardly begun to be devised.

(4) The term *democracy* itself is insufficient as

a slogan for the new order in Europe. The European theory and experience of democracy have not been the same as that of the Anglo-Saxon countries, particularly America. In France, democracy became largely severed from the Christian humanist tradition, and identified with a secular ideology which has now collapsed; it has therefore largely withered away with the revolutionary impulse which gave birth to it along with the slogan "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." Whatever our criticisms of the Vichy Government may be, we must at least acknowledge that Marshal Petain has discovered the perfect counterpart of the slogan of the French Revolution in his watchword: "Labor, Family, Country," as the object of the allegiance and effort of his people. Europe most of all needs to develop a healthy appreciation of the great simplicities and fundamental loyalties of human life. To do so, it will for some considerable time require the guidance of a firm and wise leadership rather than the strife of tongues to which the immediate institution of parliamentary democracy would lead if it were simply imposed from outside before life had become stable again and before there was once more a commonly recognized heritage of fundamental standards of value.

Spiritual Conviction a Political Force

(5) Freedom requires *conviction* if it is to have any driving power or clear vision of its goal. This is the fundamental problem of Europe today. The commonly held convictions which guided its life as a continental unit have been shattered; and the recovery of a jointly held basic conviction about the significance and purpose of human life will take time. It is at this point that Christian conviction and Christian witness has its unique and indispensable part to play in providing the foundations for the new order in Europe.

(6) In many European countries, the Christian Church has ceased to live in its own compartment apart from society as a whole. Instead of providing merely the opportunity for the satisfaction of individual religious needs and the expression of individual religious convictions, it has come to play a living part, in some cases *the* living part in focussing the spiritual aspiration of the people of its country. This situation is full of obvious danger; but it is also pregnant with immense possibilities of good. There are many signs that the leadership of the churches in these countries is being inspired and wisely led so as to make the most constructive possible use of this historic opportunity.

(7) It is becoming increasingly apparent that *spiritual conviction* is a political force, not in the sense that it interferes in the mechanisms of civil government, but in the sense that it is a *community-shaping force*. As against the dynamic and demonic

spiritual convictions which welded together the communities of National Socialism and Bolshevism, the Ecumenical Church provides the only spiritual conviction deep enough and wide enough to re-capture the loyalties and remould the aspirations of the people of Europe so as to pave the way for an enduring peace.

(8) This means that the primary task of the Christian Church is an *evangelistic* one. There are some groups in Europe, as there have recently been in Great Britain also, even among the younger members of the Malvern Conference, who believe that the Church should concentrate entirely on giving its specifically Christian witness and building up the specifically Christian Community, even at the cost of alienating other groups with whom it might be able to work together if it were to re-state its convictions in such a way as to conceal their real origin—faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. Probably the majority feel, however, that it is not only possible but indispensable to combine a well-considered and deeply felt campaign of evangelism, *particularly among the masses*, with the kind of cooperation with other groups which does not conceal the source of Christian insights into the problems of society, but interprets them in such a way that responsible secular statesmen must take them seriously and be grateful for the guidance they provide in the building of the new order.

(9) Perhaps the greatest obstacle in the way of the realization of a real new order will be the *spirit of bitterness and hatred* towards certain national groups within Europe for years after the war is over. The existence and continual intensification of this spirit make the Archbishop of York's suggestion of

a five-year interim between the cessation of hostilities and the conclusion of the ultimate peace seem a counsel of deep political wisdom. The exercise of *retributive justice* will be essential in the immediate post-war period; but as soon as conditions allow it should be succeeded by a more permanent period governed in the political as well as economic field by the more generous principle of *distributive justice*.

The way towards this most desirable of goals will be obstructed so long as statesmen and others in the democracies are given encouragement in their growing tendency to speak of vengeance as one of their main war aims, and to foment by propaganda the spirit of revenge in the occupied countries of Europe. It cannot be too strongly stated by Christian leaders everywhere, particularly in those countries where the Church has definite influence upon the powers that be, that the only worthy war aim of countries which profess to stand for everything good in the Christian civilization of Europe is the aim of justice tempered by mercy. There is an enormous difference between *retributive justice* and *vengeance*, and all possible effort should be made to make this distinction understood and applied. If this is not done, the birth of any new order at all in Europe may be delayed for many years. We all need to take seriously the confession and warning of the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church issued in September, 1941: "We have today approved the natural inclination to cherish enmity, instead of clearly and faithfully bearing witness to Christ." Today as always we are called to witness to all that Christ means for our corporate as well as individual lives; and while this witness includes the call for the highest justice, it is incompatible with the spirit of revenge.

The World Church: News and Notes

New Archbishop of Canterbury

The elevation of the Archbishop of York from York to the See of Canterbury is welcome news in this country. Indeed, it will be welcomed in all parts of the Protestant world; for Dr. Temple's remarkable gifts are recognized beyond the bounds of his nation and his Church, and his leadership has made itself felt throughout the Christian Church. A man of his intellectual gifts and of his advanced social views rises only infrequently to the highest administrative position in the Church. When he does, his opportunities of leadership are tremendous.

Dr. William Temple is not only the most distinguished theologian of the Church of England. He has also been one of the ablest exponents of social and economic reconstruction. While Bishop of Manchester he was for many years president of the Workers Education Association. The widely publicized "Malvern Report" which dealt with problems of economic reconstruction was written by him.

More recently he chaired the Commission of the Churches for International Friendship and Social Responsibility, which has just issued its report on "Social Justice and Economic Reconstruction." Since the beginning of the war he has been the most influential spokesman of all elements in British life which are concerned that the war shall issue in a just peace and a stable world order.

Dr. Temple's intellectual vigor, moral earnestness, and personal modesty, added to the authority of his new position and combined with the critical age in which he has achieved this eminence, may well make his tenure as Primate of the Church of England an epochal one, both for his own Church and for the World Council of Churches, in the organization of which he has had so prominent a part.

Chaplains in the Philippines

Reports from the Philippines reveal that the chaplains are performing an important and heroic role in the hard

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

HELEN LANE ROBERTS, *Editorial Assistant*

pressed army there. There are thirty American chaplains, Protestant and Catholic, who have held services in the jungles right behind the lines, heard confessions, distributed Bibles, cared for the wounded and the dying and buried the dead. The head of the religious work in the army of the Philippines is Colonel Alfred Oliver, who has been in the chaplain's service since 1917. He, as well as the other chaplains, has had many narrow escapes from death.

The demand for New Testaments from the men is tremendous. One chaplain reported to his chief: "I have hundreds of boys asking for them every week."

Pastoral Letter of Dutch Church

The Pastoral letter of the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church in the Netherlands, which we have already quoted in regard to the Jewish problem, is a strong and careful statement of Christian doctrine and guide to Christian conduct in times of crisis.

On the necessity of repentance it has this to say: "... In practical life we have deserted the only Lord and served other gods in all sorts of ways. We indulge in a materialistic conception of life which for a long time has been destroying the joy of the spiritual life to a far greater extent than we cared to admit. We have cherished our ideals and served them as heathen serve their idols, now the idea of a better society through an ever more ingenious application of the forces of nature, now that of a Utopia through the will and strength of the masses. In these times particularly we are in danger of uplifting our own Dutch national feeling and making it into an idol at the expense of our Christian belief. We do not wish to see this practical paganism estrange us entirely from the Way, the Truth and the Life. . . .

"Too often we do not wish to be reminded of the needs of others. We despise the poor and support the

rich. We are careless in the practice of Christian charity. We have not fought strongly enough against the sins of the people as a whole, and we have not testified—or hardly at all—against all kinds of social injustice and suppression, so that the weak in the struggle for life came to see in the Church not a helper but an enemy. We have accepted the terrible evil of unemployment far too easily and hard-heartedly as something which is unavoidable. In these times in particular we yield to the natural inclination of harboring enmity, instead of bearing testimony to Christ, simply and loyally."

The statement of the Pastoral letter on obedience to civil authority has its special relevance for an occupied nation: "... The authorities, too, are subjects in their turn, subjects of the King of kings, by Whose grace they rule and to Whom authorities and subjects alike owe obedience. Just authorities, therefore, will respect the freedom of the Church and will help her to maintain it, so that the preaching of the promises and the commandments of the Gospel may continue undisturbed. The freedom of the Church does not solely consist in the liberty for her servants to *preach* the Word of God, but also in liberty for each Christian to *obey* the Word of God in private and public life. Subjects are bound to obey authorities 'in all things which do not go against God's Word' (Article 36 of the Netherlands Confession of Faith), even if the instructions of the authorities may seem arbitrary. The Scriptures know one exception to the obligation of obedience to the authorities. When the authorities exceed the limits of their mandate and demand something which goes against God's Commandment, then the apostolic word becomes effective: 'We ought to obey God rather than men.' Authorities who do not observe these limits degenerate into tyrants. In this case one serves the authorities by acting exactly as *God* commands. The Christian community then accepts her sufferings for the sake of the Gospel. 'But and if ye suffer for righteousness' sake happy are ye.'"

The Pastoral rejects the Nazi doctrine of race with these measured words: "In the beginning a people are indeed united through certain blood-ties. But in the course of time not these ties, but the common history and the fact that the people are living together under the same roof and sharing the same responsibilities, becomes the real basis of the people's unity. And—what is still more decisive for the Christian community that follows the Scriptures, certain scriptural truths (*e.g.*, St. Matthew 12, 50; St. John I, 12, 13, 3; 19, 26-27) permanently limit the significance of blood-relationship within the bounds which the new spiritual relationship of the Church of Christ lights up with her brilliant light. . . ."

Catholics Support Jews

The Catholic clergy of Zagreb have initiated a movement of Christians who wear the star of David upon their sleeves. Thus they seek to make the discrimination against the Jews inoperative; for the Jews are required by law to wear this distinguishing mark. The Archbishop of Zagreb has been conspicuous in his efforts to mitigate the brutalities of the Pavelic regime.

Public Library
Woodward & Kirby Aves.
Detroit, Mich.

650 1-45